REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-17 and 19-36 are in the application.

§ 112 Rejections

In the Office Action, claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 32 has been amended to correct an antecedent issue with regards to the claimed TCP/IP stack. The Applicants respectfully believe this amendment overcomes this rejection and therefore respectfully request that the above rejection to claim 32 be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-17 and 19-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being based on a disclosure which the Examiner believes is not enabling. The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-17 and 19-36 are fully enabled by the specification and therefore believe this rejection is improper.

In the Office Action, the Examiner seems to suggest that the point-to-point connection described in the Applicants' disclosure requires two gateways and that the claims do not contain two gateways which the Examiner seems to believe is critical to the practice of the invention, therefore, the Examiner concludes, the claims are not enabled by the Applicants' specification. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, in the rejected claims, the Applicants are claiming a technique for monitoring and controlling message delivery over a point-to-point connection between a sender and a receiver. The Applicants' specification describes an embodiment of the claimed technique that involves two wireless gateways included in the connection where each gateway performs monitoring and controlling of message delivery over the connection in a manner that does not involve the other gateway. See page 10, lines 17-23 of the Applicants' specification as filed. Specifically, each wireless gateway monitors and controls message delivery by detecting when an incoming message is received and, generating and sending a suppression message if an acknowledgement message is not sent in response to the detected message by the receiver of the message within a certain period of time after a message has been received. Sending a suppression message

prevents the sender from timing out for failure to receive a timely acknowledgement. <u>See</u> page 3, line 19 to page 4, line 9 of Applicants' specification as filed. Each gateway performs these functions in an autonomous manner and is not dependent on the other gateway. <u>See</u> Figs. 7 and 8a-g and corresponding description starting on page 10, line 24 of Applicants' drawings and specification as filed. Thus, the above-rejected claims as they stand are fully functional on, e.g., an individual gateway and do not require the use of multiple gateways to be fully functional. Therefore, multiple gateways need not be recited in the above-rejected claims.

Second, as noted above, an enabled disclosure of the claimed technique may be found in Figs. 7 and 8a-g of the figures and their corresponding description in the specification starting at page 10, line 24. Here, the specification clearly discloses an embodiment of the claimed technique that includes a gateway that is adapted to monitor and control message delivery in accordance with the claimed technique including (1) detecting an incoming message from a sending node that is destined for a receiving node, (2) determining a timeout corresponding to the time an acknowledgement message is expected in response to the incoming message, (3) forwarding the incoming message to the receiving node and (4) sending a suppression message to the sending node if the acknowledgement has not been sent to the sending node before the timeout expires. These functions are clearly recited in the claims.

Moreover, the disclosure includes sufficient detail that would enable one skilled in the art to implement the claimed functions. Specifically, the disclosure describes a timer manager that detects an incoming message associated received on a particular connection. The timer manager then determines an expected timeout associated with message and updates an entry in a time table associated with the connection. The message is then forwarded to its destination. After the expected timeout has lapsed, the timer manager directs a segment generator to generate a suppression message for the connection. The suppression message is then sent to the originator of the message which causes the originator to pause in a persist mode with respect to the connection. <u>See</u> page 10, line 24 to page 13, line 21 of the Applicants' specification and Figs. 7 and 8a-g. Thus, the specification and drawings as filed provide support for the above claims.

For reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-17 and 19-36 are based on a disclosure which is fully functional and enabling. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the above rejections to these claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By _Michael J. Badzinski_

Michael J. Badzinski
Registration No. 51,425
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133
Dated: 5/22/06